

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

CHARLES TALBERT,	:	
	:	
Petitioner,	:	
	:	CIVIL ACTION
v.	:	
	:	15-1093
MICHELLE FARRELL, et. al.	:	
	:	
Respondent.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 3rd day of June 2015, upon careful and independent consideration of the petition for writ of habeas corpus, and after review of Magistrate Judge Lloret's report and recommendation, doc. no. 8, to which no timely objection has been made, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. The report and recommendation is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**;¹
2. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is **DISMISSED without prejudice**;
3. There is no probable cause to issue a certificate of appealability;
4. The clerk is directed to mark this case **CLOSED**.

BY THE COURT

/s/ Lawrence F. Stengel

LAWRENCE F. STENGEL, J.

¹ Since Mr. Talbert has not filed objections, I need only give some reasoned consideration to the report and recommendation. Henderson v. Carlson, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987). Mr. Talbert has clearly failed to exhaust his state court remedies, because he has not yet gone to trial on the pending state charges. The petition is symptomatic of Mr. Talbert's litigious nature rather than any extraordinary circumstance which would warrant habeas jurisdiction in this pre-trial setting. Mr. Talbert has filed seven lawsuits against state authorities during his current incarceration alone. Accordingly, I find that Judge Hart's report and recommendation is well reasoned and free of clear error. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee's note.